DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 170 HE 001 391

TITLE	Recommendations for National Action Affecting Higher Education. A Joint Statement.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 70
NOTE	15p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Federal Aid, *Federal Programs, *Higher Education, Institutional Role, *Policy, Social Responsibility, State Colleges, *State Universities

ABSTRACT

At their annual meetings in November 1969, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities adopted a "Statement of Policy Positions." Their recommendations call for: immediate funding of, first, existing federal programs providing institutional aid, then enactment of new programs; tax credit and student-loan indenture proposals; campus, rather than federal, responsibility for minimizing disruption; support for public policies against discrimination in use of public funds for educational purposes; strong opposition to a ceiling on indirect costs of federally sponsored activities and to mandatory cost sharing; full funding and expansion of the grant program and the direct loan program for academic facilities and housing; expansion of international programs; university involvement in solving social and environmental problems; support for federal-state-university cooperation and federal payment for the ROTC program. (AF)

ED037170

A Joint Statement

THIS STATEMENT OF POLICY

POSITIONS CONCERNING

Recommendations for National Action affecting Higher Education

WAS ADOPTED BY

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

AND

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

IN SESSIONS HELD DURING

NOVEMBER 1969

IN CHICAGO, ILL., AND ATLANTA, GA.

January 1970

A Note On "Federal Aid"

The term "Federal aid" is commonly used, and is used in this document, as a general term covering all the multiplicity of purposes for which Federal funds flow to institutions of higher education or those attending them. The reader should keep in mind, however, that the term "Federal aid" is inaccurate and misleading as applied to many of these programs. Where the Federal Government, in fulfillment of a clearly defined and asserted national responsibility, uses the services, facilities and personnel of colleges and universities to accomplish this purpose, the term "Federal aid" is not applicable. Indeed when the payment for this use is inadequate to cover its cost, as it frequently is, colleges and universities are supplying fiscal aid to the national government rather than the reverse. Colleges and universities have a responsibility for the national welfare which exceeds that of most other institutions in our society, and on which they are uniquely able to discharge. Willingness to give wholehearted cooperation in programs of national importance should not, however, obscure the fact that the flow of "aid," both in terms of accomplishment and in fiscal terms, is a two-way flow. Cooperation in the national interest is a better word for it.

HE 001 391

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

consists of 114 public and land-grant universities and colleges located in each of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Together, these institutions grant more than one-fourth of all the doctoral degrees awarded by American institutions of higher education.

Founded in 1887, the Association is the oldest organization of institutions of higher education in this country. It is a completely independent organization that determines its own policies and procedures by action of delegates representing all member institutions in annual convention.

Officers

Chairman of the Executive Committee

President Fred H. Harrington
University of Wisconsin, Madison

President of the Association

President Richard A. Harvill
University of Arizona, Tucson

President-Elect of the Association

President Wilson H. Elkins
University of Maryland, College Park

Executive Director of the Association

Ralph K. Huitt
National Center for Higher Education
One DuPont Circle, N.W.,
Suite 710
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7120

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

consists of 268 institutions and 16 statewide systems of state colleges located in 45 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Approximately 1.6 million students–or over one out of five college students in the United States–attend the type of institution represented by the Association. These institutions are the fastest growing degree-granting institutions in the nation.

The membership includes comprehensive state colleges and regional state universities which have developed from single-purpose teachers colleges, newly-established institutions, technological institutions, and former municipal universities and junior colleges which have become state institutions.

Officers

President of the Association

President Hilton C. Buley
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Connecticut

President-Elect of the Association

President Darrell Holmes
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado

Treasurer of the Association

President William B. Langsdorf
California State College
at Fullerton
Fullerton, California

Executive Director and Secretary of the Association

Allan W. Ostar
National Center for Higher Education
One DuPont Circle, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7070

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Needed: Not More Studies But Action	1
II.	Institutional Grants Program	4
III.	Aid to Individuals in Obtaining Post-High-School Education	5
	(A) Tax Credit for Tuition and Fees	6
	(B) Student Loan Indenture Proposal (Educational Opportunity Bank)	7
IV.	Responsibility for Minimizing Disruption in a Time of Institutional and Societal Change	10
V.	Discrimination in the Use of Public Funds for Educational Purposes	13
VI.	Indirect Costs of Federally Sponsored Activities	13
VII.	Mandatory Cost Sharing	14
VIII.	Academic Facilities, Housing	14
	(A) Academic Facilities	14
	(B) College Housing and Related Facilities	14
IX.	International Programs	15
X.	Improving Conditions of Urban and Rural Life	16
XI.	Natural Resources and Environment	16
XII.	Research and Extension on Agriculture and Related Fields	17
XIII.	Extending the Resources of Higher Education	17
XIV.	Establishment of New Federal Degree-Granting Authority and Institutions	18
XV.	Intergovernmental Cooperation: Unique Character of Higher Education	19
XVI.	Officer Education Programs	19
XVII.	Selective Services	21
XVIII.	Conclusions	21

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL ACTION AFFECTING HIGHER EDUCATION

I. *NEEDED: NOT MORE STUDIES BUT ACTION.*

The needs and future of higher education have been subject to analysis in recent years and months as never before. The process continues. Study after study, recommendation after recommendation, task force report upon task force report follow each other in confusing multiplicity.

But the times call for action.

The nation's economically, ethnically, and culturally disadvantaged are properly calling for an end to discussion about making equal access to post-high school educational opportunity available to all who seek and can benefit from it.

The problems of urban and rural poverty and blight demand attention, as do those of air and water and other environmental pollution.

The needs of the people call for a great expansion of the numbers of trained personnel in the whole range of the health professions, and for continued advances in research and in making the results of research available in practice.

Adults not in position to become full-time students are eager to improve their knowledge, both for cultural and vocational purposes.

Costs of attending college spiral as institutions, caught between rising costs, spurred by inflation on the one hand and inadequate private, state, and local support on the other, find no solution available except to increase their charges to students.

The need and demand for education to promote international understanding is greater than ever before, but the International Education Act remains unfunded. Inadequate funds for technical assistance in developing the human resources of developing countries have been further reduced.

There is general agreement among all those who have studied the problems of providing genuine equality of educational opportunity and of making the unique resources of higher education available for solution of the urgent problems of our times, that the Federal government must play a larger role in the financing of education at all levels.

The need is for a balanced program of federal assistance which will encourage the increase, rather than decrease, of non-Federal resources available from public and private sources. A balanced pro-

gram involves specific aid to disadvantaged students in the form of grants, work-study programs, low-interest loans, and special assistance of various kinds. It involves Federal aid for higher education facilities, for fellowships, for support of professional schools (particularly in the health professions). It involves expanded support for research, for adult education and community services, for developing colleges, and for institutional support for colleges and universities to keep down their spiraling charges to students.

With the exception of a program of general institutional support, the framework for providing all these essential forms of aid already is on the statute books, though it may need revision, consolidation, and rationalization.

The *primary problem*, except for badly needed institutional support, is one of *funding*–not more studies, task forces, committee reports, and the raising of expectations the lack of fulfillment of which leads to disillusionment with the capacity of our democratic society to respond through orderly processes of government.

The following will illustrate some of the funding gaps in programs duly authorized by Congress after careful consideration by committees having jurisdiction:

Higher Education Facilities Grants. Annual authorization in excess of $900 millions, including $50 million for graduate facilities. Funding: $33 million for degree-granting institutions and private junior colleges (with 75 per cent of all enrollments) and $43 million for public two-year colleges; nothing for graduate facilities.

Educational Opportunity Grants. This program, designed to give genuine educational opportunity to those most economically disadvantaged, was funded at a level to permit fewer than 100,000 *new* grants. At a minimum, 200,000 could be effectively used.

National Defense Student Loan Fund. Authorization, $375 million. Funded at $229 million, but full appropriated funds not released for use.

National Defense Education Act, College Teacher Fellowships. Authorized: 7,500 new fellowships annually. Funded to provide 3,000; a reduction of 50 per cent from earlier appropriated levels.

Community Service and Continuing Education

Act. This act was intended to be the major vehicle for enlisting the resources of colleges and universities in solving urgent community problems, and providing opportunity for further education for adult citizens. Authorization, $50 million. Funding, $9.5 million.

College Housing Loan Program. Present authorization for *direct loans*: *in excess* of $1 billion. Amount authorized to be released during current fiscal year for direct loans; about $60 million, supplemented by about $240 million in interest subsidies on private-market loans.

International Education Act. Authorized, by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress, $90 million annually. Appropriations to date: zero.

Aid to Developing Colleges. Authorized, $50 million. Appropriations: $30 million.

The above are but examples. The situation is similar with respect to a wide range of other programs.

The conclusions are clear.

Except for Federal assistance to keep down mounting charges to students which are increasingly pricing higher education out of reach of more and more students and their families, ample legislative authority exists to make a major advance.

The first priority is to fund existing programs.

The first priority among new programs is to provide institutional support for colleges and universities so they can provide quality education for all who can benefit from it at reasonable charges to students.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, who join in this statement, have proposed specific legislation to this end, (the Miller-Daddario Bill) which is now before the Congress. It enjoys the support of the Association of American Colleges, whose membership includes virtually all the nation's private colleges. It has the support of the Association of American Universities, including the nation's leading graduate and research universities, public and private. Other major national organizations have endorsed the principle of institutional support.

Such a program is badly needed not only to keep

down rising charges, but also to correct the imbalance between emphasis on research and instruction created by past Federal concentration on research.

The country is increasingly bewildered by the flood of studies, proposals, and re-proposals being put forward. Some of these are excellent, some mere nostrums and panaceas. The proliferation of new proposals while major gaps exist between promise and performance in existing programs is a major factor in the disillusionment and disaffection of many of our young people.

The path to great achievement in social, cultural, and economic advance is well marked. It is the education of all Americans to their highest potential and the fullest use of the special resources of our colleges and universities in research and public service.

The times call for action.

II. *INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS PROGRAM.*

As we noted, the greatest unmet need in Federal support for higher education is an *institutional* support program through which flexible, predictable funds are made available to colleges and universities on a continuing basis. These Associations urge that such a program is vital to the welfare of the nation and is needed *now*. Further, we believe that the institutional grants program should be initiated in the natural and social sciences where there already exists a solid base of experience in relations between the Federal agencies and the academic community.

We are mindful of the need for institutional grants in the arts and the humanities, as well as in the natural and social sciences. However, the long experience with programs in the sciences and wide acceptance of Federal participation in them, together with the existence of a substantial and experienced administrative staff in the National Science Foundation, suggests that new and comprehensive institutional support may best be started in those fields.

More nearly adequate funding should be provided immediately for project grants in the arts and humanities. We believe such grants can be of special benefit to the culturally and economically disadvantaged. After a period of experience with expanded project grants through the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, these disciplines might then be included in a formula for general institutional support.

Bills for the establishment of a National Institutional Grants Program have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and H.R. 11542 has been overwhelmingly approved by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics after extensive hearings spanning two sessions of the Congress in which the principle of institutional support was strongly endorsed by almost all witnesses. The bill, as refined through public debate, is admirably suited for the initiation of this urgently needed program. We commend Representatives George P. Miller, Emilio Q. Daddario, and others for their sponsorship of this proposal, and strongly urge its early passage in the House and its serious and early consideration in the Senate.

III. *AID TO INDIVIDUALS IN OBTAINING POST-HIGH-SCHOOL EDUCATION.*

As indicated above, these Associations believe that a balanced program of assuring access to post-high-school educational opportunity includes support to institutions to keep charges to students down, combined with direct aid to individuals facing particular economic, ethnic, or cultural disadvantages. The Congress has established a substantial and varied program of aid, including Economic Opportunity Grants, N.D.E.A. loans, work-study programs, and support of special services to disadvantaged students. It also includes pre-college assistance and encouragement, as exemplified by the Upward Bound, Talent Search, and other programs. Special aid to developing colleges also involves particular attention and support to institutions which serve a high percentage of disadvantaged students. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program falls into a slightly different category, as it is designed to ease the burden on middle-income families caused by increases in college charges substantially in excess of the increases in real income and those attributable to inflation. It serves a useful purpose, though the necessity for it will be diminished if measures to increase public support and encourage private voluntary support are taken to keep down charges to students.

These Associations supported the enactment and urge the full implementation of all the above programs. One hundred per cent Federal financing should be provided for the N.D.E.A. Student Loan Program, in order that needy students may not suffer from institutional incapacity to find matching money.

The Associations, however, STRONGLY

OPPOSE two proposals which have been widely advocated under the rubric of student aid. They are discussed below:

TAX-CREDIT AND STUDENT-LOAN INDENTURE PROPOSALS

Proposals for a direct deduction from income taxes owed the Federal government because of tuition and required fees paid colleges and universities have attracted substantial support because of several assumptions, all incorrect.

More recently, widespread publicity has been given a proposal to solve the fiscal problems of higher education by a sharp increase in charges to students coupled with the privilege of borrowing from the Federal government the increasingly substantial sums required, with repayment by the borrower in the form of a special added income tax over 30 to 40 years. Both these proposals are unsound from the standpoint of public policy, educational policy, and fiscal policy. They are discussed separately below:

(A) *Tax Credit for Tuition and Fees*

Three assumptions, the first two contradictory and the third untrue, are made in advancing such proposals:

The first is that they will provide relief to hard-pressed parents. A second is that they provide a way around the problems related to direct Federal aid to non-public institutions and would, therefore, provide a substantial flow of Federal tax dollars to these and other institutions. A third is that they are so devised as to limit sharply or eliminate aid to the most affluent and to give the greatest aid to those in lower income brackets (though admittedly none at all to those who pay no income tax). The first two assumptions are obviously contradictory. If institutions raise fees to collect tax dollars, parents will get no relief. If parents get substantial relief, institutions will not be aided.

The third assumption is untrue. Despite limitations on benefits in terms of gross taxable income, the most recent version of this proposal advanced before Congress allows families with taxable incomes of up to $25,000 to receive full benefits, and those with incomes substantially in excess of this amount to receive some benefits. Those with capital-gain incomes well in excess of the stated limitation would, of course, receive special treatment, while those with incomes chiefly from tax-exempt sources would benefit without limitation as to total, as compared to taxable, income.

While percentage benefits are theoretically higher for lower-income families, actual dollar benefits steadily diminish at the lower end of the income scale, and vanish entirely for those who pay little or no taxable income but nevertheless sacrifice heavily for their children's future, in terms of income paid out and loss of family earnings. Indeed, this proposal has been correctly described as an "upside down scholarship."

These Associations view the tax-credit proposal as inequitable from every standpoint and unsound from that of fiscal policy, educational policy, and national policy in general. The Treasury Department, whose estimates on first-year cost of such a proposal are in the neighborhood of $2 billion annually, has ably stated the objections from the standpoint of national fiscal policy, as has the distinguished Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Proponents of this legislation have made it clear that its essential purpose is to give tax support to educational institutions proportional, to some extent at least, to the fees charged students. Since the fees would have to be raised to provide the additional income desired, the benefit would flow to the college, not the taxpayer. To the extent that fees are raised, students from low-income families would find their educational costs increased rather than decreased. Institutions with low tuition charges would be placed under pressure to increase them in order to collect Federal aid by this route. Institutions which wish to engage in discriminatory practices and still enjoy Federal support would be encouraged to do so.

These Associations take the position that, to the extent that Congress finds it in the national interest to provide either general or specific-purpose support from public funds to institutions of higher education, ways can and should be found for doing this which retain the principle of public accountability for the expenditure of public funds, which are fiscally and educationally sound, and which do not in their operation discriminate against large groups of students and institutions. The tax-credit approach does not meet these standards.

(B) *Student Loan Indenture Proposal (Educational Opportunity Bank)*

This proposal, described by its proponents as an "Educational Opportunity Bank" or a "National

Youth Endowment Fund," can, in fact, be more accurately described as one through which the student is asked to enter into a special Federal income-tax indenture for most of his working life in order to permit colleges and universities to recapture approximately the full cost of educational services through sharp increases in required charges. Its most glaring defect from the standpoint of public policy is that it proposes to shift to the student the cost, at an escalating rate, of higher education. Whatever the allocation between the individual and society of the benefits of higher education, it is clear that the primary benefit is to society. The argument that the privilege of borrowing large sums with deferred repayment will somehow increase educational opportunity for the economically and educationally disadvantaged will not bear analysis for several reasons; rather, it would, under the name of equality of opportunity, enable a low-income student to start life with a heavy added Federal claim on his income, while freeing the more affluent from similar responsibility.

The policy of escalating student charges in all types of institutions would raise economic barriers against low-income and educationally disadvantaged students in institutions which will now admit them and which they can attend at relatively low cost. It would not, however, permit them to attend institutions which are prepared neither to relax their admissions standards nor to expand their enrollments in any substantial degree. The highly qualified student from a low-income family can, in general, already attend college through a variety of scholarship programs for the talented. The problem of the educationally disadvantaged student involves a variety of factors. High admission standards, reluctance to borrow, need of his family for income, and lack of motivation are all elements in his disproportionately low participation in post-high-school education. These problems will not be solved by extending the privilege of borrowing theoretically to enable the student to shop around for a college which will grant him admission, in competition with other students with fewer academic and other handicaps.

The Educational Opportunity Bank proposal poses many other major questions, to which answers have not been forthcoming. Its fiscal solvency is clearly dependent on attracting an equal balance between those whose future incomes will be high

and those entering low-income professions to permit continued lendings to those whose repayments will be less than their loans. Yet, to be fiscally attractive to those entering high-income occupations or with family resources which assure high incomes, terms must be such that a large fiscal outlay by the Federal government seems a prerequisite. If the charges of all colleges are escalated sharply, present ability of the vast majority of students to finance their own education through family aid and earnings will disappear, and heavy borrowing will become for increasing numbers the only avenue of access to higher education. The Educational Opportunity Bank particularly belies its title with respect to young women seeking higher education. The burden imposed by the combined loans of husband and wife could impose harsh strains on a new family. Marriage would involve a substantial reverse dowry.

Economists who have analyzed the proposal since it was first put forward in specific form by the Panel on Educational Innovation have pointed out:

1. Although the intent of the proposal is that students should pay for their own education through long-term borrowing, the initial effect will be to require a sharp increase in Federal taxes or a sharp decrease in Federal expenditure for other public programs. One or the other would be needed to avoid the inflation caused by billions of dollars in borrowing anticipated, with no counterbalancing flow of repayments in the early years.

2. While the proposal was also presented as being of particular assistance to private institutions, and as one not intended to reduce present sources of non-Federal support to higher education, the analysis referred to suggests that private institutions will be relatively worse off under operations of the Bank unless states reduce their support of public colleges and universities and force increases in student charges. Our Associations are committed to the belief that Federally-sponsored programs should enable public and private institutions to hold down the cost of education to students and their families, thereby making educational opportunity more widely available to all. Proposals to this end are outlined elsewhere in this document.

Higher education in the United States has been the means of providing genuine equality of opportunity for increasing numbers of young men and women because the American people have recognized that education is primarily a social responsibility. They have supported our colleges and uni-

versities both directly through public channels and indirectly through voluntary support encouraged by special tax treatment, thus keeping down the financial barriers to education. The philosophy that financing education is primarily the responsibility of the student is directly contrary to this great and sound tradition.

IV. *RESPONSIBILITY FOR MINIMIZING DISRUPTION IN A TIME OF INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIETAL CHANGE.*

Resort to confrontation, destruction, and violence has become an increasingly disturbing phenomenon in American life. The demands for, and the necessity of, societal change challenge the capacity of all our institutions to adjust to new conditions through orderly processes while protecting fully the freedom to dissent.

Destruction, violence, and confrontation have occurred in relation to issues involving urban problems, church problems, business, industrial and labor problems, civil rights and educational problems at all levels, to name a few. Young people, including college and university students, have been prominently involved in many of these activities. That they have also been much more heavily identified with efforts to accomplish needed change through orderly procedures is less well known because less publicized.

No level of government and no type of public or private organization has been demonstrably more successful than others in dealing either with the problems of violent confrontation, or in accelerating the processes of orderly and needed change which are basic to a reduction of tension and conflict. All have been relatively unprepared to cope with violence, all relatively slow to change.

Colleges and universities were particularly vulnerable to confrontation and violence, because they had experienced relatively little of it. Mechanisms for governance and for orderly resolution of grievances which they thought adequate proved in some cases inadequate in the test. College and university regulations, and civil laws and procedures, were in many instances found to be defective both to protect the innocent and punish the guilty.

The American tradition and practice has been substantially that the preservation of public order has been left to local authority, supplemented by state authority when needed, with Federal law and authority resorted to only when other remedies

were clearly inadequate. The involvement of local civil authorities has been relatively infrequent with respect to members of the college and university community, where respect for the rights of others and the use of internal disciplinary mechanisms have normally sufficed.

It is perhaps a tribute to the high esteem in which the American public holds its institutions of higher education that many proposals have been made and some enacted into law for Federal intervention in matters of campus disturbances. Since "news" is by definition a deviation from the past or the expected, it is perhaps a tribute to the historic ability of the university community to conduct its affairs in a peaceful manner that communications media have focussed so intensively on every instance of campus disruption and so little on the widespread instances of orderly change, or of both responsible and equitable dealing with disruption when it occurs.

These Associations believe that it is no more desirable or appropriate for the Federal government to pass special laws dealing with campus disruption than to pass special laws dealing with disruption in municipalities, counties, states or in hospitals, museums, community theaters, farms, or in elementary and secondary schools—public and private—all involved in some aspects of Federal programs.

This view does not spring from self-righteousness, illusion, or timidity. No occupational group in American life is more opposed to campus disruption, has more to lose from its occurrence, is more conscious of the fact that mistakes have been and will be made, than college and university administrators.

It is cold realism and hard experience which causes us to say that any substantial degree of direct Federal intervention with respect to campus disturbances is counter-productive of the common objective of minimizing them. Detailed Federal legal prescriptions and procedures are invitations to prolonged court procedures following institutional action. Mandatory and severe Federal penalties against particular classes of students (because recipients of Federal assistance) create manifest injustices in situations in which it is crucial that justice *be* and *be seen to be equitable* in terms of the degree of the offense, and no other criteria. Colleges and universities are not *in fact* free to move promptly under their own regulations and procedures if bound to use a different set of regu-

lations, procedures, and penalties by Federal law. By the same token, state and local civil authorities and courts are *not in fact free* of outside pressures, if they know that identical penalties assessed against young men guilty of identical offenses may automatically result in far heavier Federally-imposed penalties in one case, and none in the other.

Even the relatively mild proposal that all institutions of higher education be Federally required to prepare disciplinary regulations or lose all Federal funds inevitably carries with it both the implication that the many will be punished for the sins of the few and that Federal prescription of detailed regulations may follow. Is the Federal government to require codes of regulations for disturbances in cities, counties, and states? Shall we cut off water supplies from Federally-impounded lakes to cities which have not found the solution to confrontations over the local control of schools? Or should they be required to see that no one involved in a municipal confrontation is permitted to use the Federally-aided water system?

Colleges and universities have been challenged to act. *They have acted*. Penalties have been assessed, after hearings in accordance with due process. In recent months, most colleges and universities have revised their regulations, both with respect to protecting individual rights and to punishing those who resort to violence. State and local laws have, in many instances, been similarly revised and clarified to remove ambiguities as to public buildings and property. A great deal of experience has been gained, directly and vicariously, in dealing with the relatively new problem of disruption.

More importantly, many colleges and universities have undertaken substantial revision of their internal governance, in response to student requests for a real voice in policies that directly affect them.

Campus disruptions will continue, as they will in other areas of American life. No amount of reform or change will satisfy the small minority whose purpose is to destroy the university, rather than to accomplish needed reforms. The degree of disruption and confrontation may depend substantially on developments in American society wholly outside the control of the college or university as such. However, the content and application of university regulations and the authority for enacting and enforcing laws against disruptive activities *wherever they occur* are and should be the responsibility of those who have responsibility for campus gover-

nance, and state and local legislation and law enforcement. We have faith that if this continues to be the case, the destruction-bent minority will be increasingly isolated and ineffective.

V. *DISCRIMINATION IN THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES*

Member institutions of the Association support public policies against discrimination in the use of public funds for educational purposes, and believe these policies should apply equally in their use to all types of institutions, public and private. They note with regret that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not uniformly apply this standard because of the failure to include a provision against discrimination because of religion in Title VI of the Act, which applies to non-public as well as to public colleges and universities. They also note that Title IV of the Act, which requires a survey of the extent of discrimination in education to be made by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, applies only to public institutions and does not apply to discrimination in the use of public funds by non-public institutions receiving them.

It is, therefore, our position that the Civil Rights Act should be amended to ban the use of public funds by institutions which discriminate in the admission of students or employment of staff because of religion, and that, pending such amendment or new educational legislation, the use of tax funds should be barred to institutions which discriminate because of religion. If there is reasonable ground for exception to this rule, such as might be involved in programs of public welfare, rather than of an essentially educational, character–such as the school lunch program–such exceptions should be made by explicit exemption from the general rule.

VI. *INDIRECT COSTS OF FEDERALLY-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES.*

Indirect costs of Federally-sponsored activities are real costs that, unless fully reimbursed, constitute a serious drain on the resources of the college or university–resources that are required for carrying out their primary institutional function and for the conduct of programs where Federal support is limited or lacking. The Associations strongly oppose imposition of any arbitrary ceiling on recovery of indirect costs for the reasons contained

in a study made for the Congress this year by the General Accounting Office.

VII. *MANDATORY COST-SHARING.*

The Associations stenuously object to the mandatory cost-sharing concept, with respect to Federally sponsored research programs. Simply equity dictates that institutions making available their physical and human resources to assist in the attainment of national objectives receive the full costs for doing so, especially when the cost sharing reduces their ability to contrbute to the attainment of other, and equally important, national objectives.

VIII. *ACADEMIC FACILITIES, HOUSING.*

(A) *Academic Facilities.* A report issued in the fall of 1969 by a U.S. Office of Education Task Force estimated a deficiency of 68 million feet of assignable academic space in our colleges and universities as of the fall of 1968, and a need for a net addition of 241 million square feet of assignable space to handle enrollment increase projected by 1977. The Task Force estimated a need for a commitment of $2.8 billion annually from 1970 through 1974. Federal authorizations for facilities aid include authority for direct grants of up to 50 per cent of cost of facilities, for direct loans, and for interest subsidy on loans made in the private market. These Associations supported the interest subsidy proposal as a means of expanding the facilities-aid program in a time of temporary budget stringency as a *supplement* to the direct loan program and the grant program. The Administration proposed, with respect to degree-granting institutions, to eliminate the grant program in the fiscal 1970 budget and to eliminate the direct-loan program for all institutions.

We recommend full funding of the grant program and the direct-loan program to the extent of the authorization provided in law. The interest subsidy program, substantially more costly in the long run than the direct-loan program, should be used only as an emergency supplement.

(B) *College Housing and Related Facilities.* The committee cited above estimated a requirement for residential, dining, and related facilities for an additional 750,000 students by 1977, at a cost of $7.9 billion. Authorizations exist for more than $1 billion in direct Federal loans, and money available

is being increased substantially each year by repayments into a revolving fund. Although the present interest rate for the direct loan program involves a slight subsidy because of prevailing high interest rates, the program up to the end of fiscal 1969 has shown a profit to the Federal government in excess of expenditures. Again as a supplement to the direct program in a time of budget stringency, the Congress authorized a supplemental interest subsidy program for private loans. During fiscal 1970, the direct loan program was reduced from its past $200 million level to approximately $60 million, the more costly interest subsidy program (over the years) being substituted for, rather than used as a supplement to, the direct program. The *direct loan and grant program should be rapidly expanded and the interest subsidy program held to its original purpose as a supplement, if needed.*

IX. *INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS.*

More than any other nation, the United States of America stands to benefit from programs in the international area. These include domestic programs provided under the National Defense Education Act and envisioned under the International Education Act, educational and cultural exchange programs (such as those authorized by the Fulbright-Hays Act), and technical assistance to developing nations under the Foreign Assistance Act.

Failure to fund the International Education Act and cutbacks in technical assistance programs are discouraging. On the other hand, steps to place university relationships in technical assistance on a sounder basis and to give greatly increased emphasis on helping developing nations build the educational and professional competence they need to move forward, under the leadership of Administrator John A. Hannah, are hopeful signs, as is the renewed spirit of bi-partisanship in support of international activities.

Democracy has everything to gain from the free exchange of people and ideas and the free movement of international commerce. It has much to lose from a policy of indifference to the plight of millions in other countries who look to us for assistance in improving their conditions of life.

Out of the conviction that knowledge of the history, culture, languages, and problems of other peoples of the world is essential to the sound education of American citizens today, our institutions have in recent years greatly expanded their

offerings in internationally-related fields. Particularly at the undergraduate level, and substantially at other levels, this expansion has been financed by non-Federal sources of income, including state legislatures, student fees, and private donors. We intend to continue this emphasis.

National support and national leadership are essential, however if college and university-related international educational and cultural exchange and technical assistance programs are to be adequate to the interests and responsibilities of the United States. Both the national interest and responsibility are clear.

X. *IMPROVING CONDITIONS OF URBAN AND RURAL LIFE.*

The problems of our center cities, linked as they are with conditions of poverty, inadequate education, and unemployment, are properly a major focus of public concern. These problems, it is clear, are also inextricably linked with those of poverty, inadequate education, and lack of suitable employment in non-urban, non-metropolitan areas, where 29 percent of the population includes 41 percent of those classified as below the "poverty" line.

Member institutions of these Associations have a traditional role of concern for and action related to the conditions of the citizenry. This concern is now intensified and expanded by the tremendous problems of a rapidly urbanizing society. Member institutions of these Associations are heavily involved in research, educational, and public service programs designed to improve the conditions of rural and urban life. The chief limitation on their ability to respond to urgent requests for expert assistance is lack of resources for this purpose, particularly as related to urban problems.

XI. *NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.*

The member institutions of these Associations share the general informed concern for the need for conservation and intelligent utilization of our natural resources and for the abatement of the increasing pollution of our natural environment. For this reason, we have welcomed the Water Resources Research Act, the Sea Grant College and Program Act, and the programs established in the Department of the Interior, the Public Health Service, and

the Environmental Sciences Service Administration in the Department of Commerce aimed at the understanding and abatement of air and water pollution.

These programs, as were those for continuing education and public service, were initiated during a period of budget constriction for domestic programs, and should be funded consistently high with their priority at the earliest possible time.

Further, we urge continuing emphasis in the administration of the Sea Grant College and Program Act on the importance of broad, flexible institutional awards.

XII. *RESEARCH AND EXTENSION IN AGRICULTURE AND RELATED FIELDS.*

The cooperative programs of research and education in agriculture and related fields between the Federal government and Land-Grant institutions have been conspicuously successful. Indeed, these programs have been a major factor in the development in the United States of the most productive and efficient agriculture in the history of mankind.

It is recognized that the consumer is the principal beneficiary of these programs. Consequently, it is in the public interest to maintain a level of Federal financial support which will enable these programs to make their maximum contribution to the nation's agriculture and ultimately to the consuming public.

The Associations are concerned that Federal support in recent years has lagged substantially behind rising costs, requiring the states to carry an increasing proportion of the cost of these cooperative efforts. Major long-range studies of both agricultural research and extension programs have been made by joint committees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The recommendations of these committees offer sound and constructive suggestions for reorienting and expanding both programs.

XIII. *EXTENDING THE RESOURCES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.*

The Congress has recognized the great need for Federal action to make available the resources of our colleges and universities toward the solution of problems of national and international concern. We applaud the enactment of such legislation as Title I

of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the State Technical Services Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, legislation affecting the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, the Law Enforcement Act, and the Smith-Lever Act establishing the Cooperative Extension Service, which has furnished the example inspiring many of the more recent programs. Through the implementation of programs of continuing education and extension authorized by these and other acts, the Congress enables universities to bring their unique resources to bear on the needs of communities and individuals for assistance in solving the multiple problems associated with rapid urbanization, technological change, social change, and the needs of the professions, agriculture, labor, business, industry, the delivery of health service, and the Federal government.

Truly significant progress cannot be expected from these programs until it is possible to fund them at levels commensurate with the needs they were established to help satisfy.

XIV. *ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW FEDERAL DEGREE-GRANTING AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTIONS.*

In recent years, many efforts have been made, some successfully, to authorize the granting of advanced academic degrees by Federal agencies or establishments. We believe these efforts arise from basic confusion as to the nature of a university, the significance and meaning of the academic degree, and the resources of the non-Federal academic establishment.

The basic characteristic of the university as a center for the advancement of knowledge is one of free inquiry, free exchange of the results of research with other scholars in the field, and free criticism. Another characteristic is the opportunity offered for educating men and women in the processes and methods of research. The academic degree is a recognition of educational attainment and research accomplishment under conditions of free inquiry, exchange, and criticism. Its use by agencies or institutions, which are not, and cannot, become universities in this sense of the term is a misuse which is both undesirable and unnecessary.

XV. *INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION: UNIQUE CHARACTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION.*

The Associations strongly support activities designed to improve cooperation between the Federal government and state and local governments and to increase the capacity of state and local governments to provide the quality and variety of public services needed in our complex society.

They emphatically call attention, however, to the unique character of higher education as an instrumentality of society. All the states have, by constitutional or legislative action, placed responsibility for governance of public universities and colleges under the control and direction of governing boards separated from direct channels of state administrative and political control. Private institutions have historically enjoyed this status.

In recent years, national legislative proposals have been made which would have the effect of authorizing the administrative branch of the Federal government to require that staffs of both public and private universities and colleges engaged in Federally assisted programs be placed under state merit systems, channeling Federal funds for higher education through state administrative agencies having no jurisdiction under state constitutions or law, bypassing state legislative authority, and assigning planning responsibility for higher education within the states to agencies created for entirely different purposes.

Since inadvertance or lack of awareness of the issues and relationships involved apparently have been responsible for violation in proposed legislation of this sound principle, the Associations respectfully call it to the attention of Congressional committees, Federal agencies dealing with educational legislation, and the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

XVI. *OFFICER EDUCATION PROGRAMS*

Public and Land-Grant universities and colleges have, from their founding, held to the philosophy that their responsibilities include provision of opportunity for advanced education for a wide range of occupations in private and public life. Other institutions have increasingly shared that philosophy and responsibility.

As a result, leadership in every phase and field of American life has come from individuals from a

wide range of backgrounds: institutional, regional, economic, ethnic, social.

In only one area, that of preparing officers for the Armed Services, has the Federal government established its own institutions of higher education. However, for many years the vast majority of regular and reserve officers for the Armed Services have come from non-Federal colleges and universities. The two Associations believe that (1) is is appropriate for institutions of the type represented in their membership to offer courses and programs of interest to those wishing to serve as officers in the Armed Services, as they do for other occupational fields, and (2) that it would be highly undesirable for officer education to be restricted to the service academies.

With respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program as such, controversies over issues such as the amount of credit for course work, jurisdiction over the selection of instructors, and the nature and content of the curriculum have arisen in a relatively small number of institutions. The Department of Defense has indicated a recognition of the desirability of certain reforms and a greater degree of flexibility in program. This points to the probability that most institutions involved or desiring to be involved in officer-education programs will find it possible to conduct them through the R.O.T.C.

Colleges and universities make a most substantial financial contribution to officer-education through the R.O.T.C. program. They provide, without charge to the Federal government, classroom, office, and other facilities and departmental support. Although the question of at least partial reimbursement for these costs has been under discussion for more than 20 years, no action has resulted.

Meanwhile, the problem becomes increasingly critical as enrollments and pressures on use of facilities rise, accompanied by sharp reductions in funds available from governmental and private sources for needed new construction.

The Associations commend the generally constructive report of the Special Committee on R.O.T.C. named by the Secretary of Defense, and endorse in particular its recommendations (1) for amendment of the R.O.T.C. Revitalization Act to indicate the cooperative nature of R.O.T.C. curriculum development as between institutions of higher education and the Armed Services and (2) for Federal payment of the full institutional costs of

the R.O.T.C. program. The Associations are hopeful that the fixing of specific responsibility for R.O.T.C. matters at the Department of Defense level in the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Education) will improve liaison with higher education and expedite early action on needed administrative and legislative changes.

The Associations strongly recommend that Advisory Panels on R.O.T.C. of both the Department of Defense and the several Armed Services include representatives of the major institutional organizations in higher education.

XVII. *SELECTIVE SERVICE.*

The Associations commend the President and the Congress for the authorization and establishment of procedures under the present Selective Service Act providing for one year of maximum vulnerability to call and for a random selection system of determining order of induction, within the established prime age group. This will enable young men to plan their future with more certainty and also eliminate the heavy impact of the former "oldest first" rule on graduate and professional education, while assuring that students deferred for higher education will be subject to call in the same proportion as other qualified registrants.

XVIII. *CONCLUSION.*

There is, as Shakespeare said, a time for all things. The time has come in higher education for a cessation of new studies and pronouncements on the national role in higher education and for a real beginning of *action* to implement programs on whose objectives there has long been general agreement. With the exception of a national program of general institutional support to colleges and universities, authorizing legislation both to provide access to higher education for the disadvantaged and to make available the resources of higher education toward solving many of the most pressing problems of our time has long been on the statute books.

The times call for action.

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

AND

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF

STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ALABAMA
- *Alabama A & M University*
- Alabama State University
- *Auburn University*
- Florence State University
- Jacksonville State University
- Livingston State University
- Troy State University
- *University of Alabama*
- University of Montevallo
- University of South Alabama

ALASKA
- *University of Alaska*

ARIZONA
- *Arizona State University*
- Northern Arizona University
- *University of Arizona*

ARKANSAS
- *Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College*
- Arkansas A & M College
- Arkansas Polytechnic College
- Arkansas State University
- Henderson State College
- Southern State College
- State College of Arkansas
- *University of Arkansas*

CALIFORNIA
- California State College at Bakersfield
- California State College at Dominguez Hills
- California State College at Fullerton
- California State College at Hayward
- California State College at Long Beach
- California State College at Los Angeles
- California State College at San Bernardino
- California State Polytechnic College–Kellogg-Voorhis
- California State Polytechnic College
- Chico State College
- Fresno State College
- Humboldt State College
- Sacramento State College
- San Diego State College
- San Fernando Valley State College
- San Francisco State College
- San Jose State College
- Sonoma State College
- Stanislaus State College
- *University of California*
- *University of California at Berkeley*
- *University of California at Davis*
- *University of California at Los Angeles*

COLORADO
- Adams State College
- Colorado State College
- *Colorado State University*
- Fort Lewis College
- Metropolitan State College
- Southern Colorado State College
- *University of Colorado*
- Western State College of Colorado

CONNECTICUT
- *Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station*
- Central Connecticut State College
- Eastern Connecticut State College
- Southern Connecticut State College
- *University of Connecticut*
- Western Connecticut State College

DELAWARE
- *Delaware State College*
- *University of Delaware*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
- District of Columbia Teachers College
- *Federal City College

FLORIDA
- *Florida A & M University
- Florida Atlantic University
- Florida International University
- *Florida State University*
- Florida Technological University
- *University of Florida*
- University of North Florida
- University of West Florida

GEORGIA
- Albany State College
- Armstrong State College
- Augusta College
- Columbus College
- *Fort Valley State College*
- Georgia College at Milledgeville
- *Georgia Institute of Technology*
- Georgia Southern College
- Savannah State College
- *University of Georgia*
- Valdosta State College
- West Georgia College

GUAM
- University of Guam

HAWAII
- *University of Hawaii*

IDAHO
- Boise State College
- Idaho State University
- Lewis-Clark Normal School
- *University of Idaho*

ILLINOIS
- Chicago State College
- Eastern Illinois University
- Governors State University
- Illinois State University
- Northeastern Illinois State College
- Northern Illinois University
- Sangamon State University
- *Southern Illinois University*
- *University of Illinois*
- Western Illinois University

INDIANA
- Ball State University
- Indiana State University
- *Indiana University*
- *Purdue University*

IOWA
- *Iowa State University*
- *University of Iowa*
- University of Northern Iowa

KANSAS
- Fort Hays Kansas State College
- Kansas State College of Pittsburg
- Kansas State Teachers College
- *Kansas State University*
- *University of Kansas*
- Wichita State University

KENTUCKY
- Eastern Kentucky University
- Morehead State University
- Murray State University
- *Kentucky State College*
- *University of Kentucky*
- Western Kentucky University

LOUISIANA
- Francis T. Nicholls State College
- Grambling College
- Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
- *Louisiana State University*
- McNeese State College
- Northeast Louisiana State College
- Northwestern State College
- Southeastern Louisiana College
- *Southern University*

MAINE
- Aroostook State College
- Farmington State College
- Fort Kent State College
- Gorham State College
- Maine Maritime Academy
- *University of Maine*
- *University of Maine–Orono*
- Washington State College

MARYLAND
- Bowie State College
- Coppin State College
- Frostburg State College
- *Maryland State College*
- Morgan State College
- St. Mary's College of Maryland
- Salisbury State College
- Towson State College
- *University of Maryland*

MASSACHUSETTS
- Boston State College
- Bridgewater State College
- Fitchburg State College
- Framingham State College
- Lowell State College
- Massachusetts College of Art
- *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*
- Massachusetts Maritime Academy
- North Adams State College
- Salem State College
- *University of Massachusetts*
- Westfield State College
- Worcester State College

MICHIGAN
- Central Michigan University
- Eastern Michigan University
- Ferris State College
- Grand Valley State College
- Lake Superior State College
- *Michigan State University*
- Northern Michigan University
- *University of Michigan*
- *Wayne State University*

MINNESOTA
- Bemidji State College
- Mankato State College
- Moorhead State College
- St. Cloud State College
- Southwest Minnesota State College
- *University of Minnesota*
- Winona State College

MISSISSIPPI
- *Alcorn Agricultural & Mechanical College
- Delta State College
- Jackson State College
- Mississippi State College for Women
- *Mississippi State University*
- Mississippi Valley State College
- *University of Mississippi*
- University of Southern Mississippi

MISSOURI
- Central Missouri State College
- Harris Teachers College
- *Lincoln University*
- Missouri Southern College
- Missouri Western College
- Northeast Missouri State College
- Northwest Missouri State College
- Southeast Missouri State College
- Southwest Missouri State College
- *University of Missouri*

MONTANA
- Eastern Montana College
- Montana College of Mineral Science & Technology
- *Montana State University*
- Northern Montana College
- *University of Montana*
- Western Montana College

NEBRASKA
- Chadron State College
- Kearney State College
- Peru State College
- *University of Nebraska*
- Wayne State College

NEVADA
- University of Nevada at Las Vegas
- *University of Nevada at Reno*
- *University of Nevada System*

NEW HAMPSHIRE
- Keene State College
- Plymouth State College
- *University of New Hampshire*

NEW JERSEY
- College of North Jersey
- Glassboro State College
- Jersey City State College
- Montclair State College
- Newark State College
- Paterson State College
- Richard Stockton State College
- *Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey*

NEW MEXICO
- Eastern New Mexico University
- *New Mexico State University*
- *University of New Mexico*
- Western New Mexico University

NEW YORK
- *City University of New York*
- *Cornell University*
- State University College at Brockport
- State University College at Buffalo
- State University College at Cortland
- State University College at Geneseo
- State University College at New Paltz
- State University College at Old Westbury
- State University College at Oneonta
- State University College at Oswego
- State University College at Plattsburgh
- State University College at Potsdam
- *State University of New York*
- *State University of New York at Albany
- *State University of New York at Buffalo*
- *State University of New York at Binghamton*
- *State University of New York at Stony Brook*

NORTH CAROLINA
- Appalachian State University
- East Carolina University
- Elizabeth City State University
- Fayetteville State College
- *North Carolina A & T State University*
- North Carolina Central University
- *North Carolina State University*
- Pembroke State University
- University of North Carolina at Asheville
- *University of North Carolina*
- *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*
- Western Carolina University
- Winston-Salem State College

NORTH DAKOTA
- Dickinson State College
- Mayville State College
- Minot State College
- *North Dakota State University*
- *University of North Dakota*
- University of North Dakota Ellendale Center
- Valley City State College

OHIO
- Bowling Green State University
- Central State University
- The Cleveland State University
- *Kent State University*
- *Miami University*
- *Ohio State University*
- *Ohio University*
- University of Akron
- University of Toledo
- Youngstown State University
- Wright State University

OKLAHOMA
- Central State College
- East Central State College
- *Langston University*
- Northeastern State College
- Northwestern State College
- *Oklahoma State University*
- Southeastern State College
- *University of Oklahoma*

OREGON
- Eastern Oregon College
- *Oregon State University*
- Oregon Technical Institute
- Southern Oregon College
- *University of Oregon*

PENNSYLVANIA
- Bloomsburg State College
- California State College
- Cheyney State College
- Clarion State College
- East Stroudsburg State College
- Edinboro State College
- Indiana University of Pennsylvania
- Kutztown State College
- Lock Haven State College
- Mansfield State College
- Millersville State College
- *Pennsylvania State University*
- Shippensburg State College
- Slippery Rock State College
- West Chester State College

PUERTO RICO
- *University of Puerto Rico*

RHODE ISLAND
- Rhode Island College
- *University of Rhode Island*

SOUTH CAROLINA
- *Clemson University*
- *South Carolina State College*
- *University of South Carolina*

SOUTH DAKOTA
- Black Hills State College
- Dakota State College
- Northern State College
- *South Dakota State University*
- Southern State College
- *University of South Dakota*

TENNESSEE
- Austin Peay State University
- East Tennessee State University
- Memphis State University
- Middle Tennessee State University
- *Tennessee A & I State University*
- Tennessee Technological University
- *University of Tennessee*

TEXAS
- East Texas State University
- Midwestern University
- North Texas State University
- *Prairie View Agricultural & Mechanical College*
- Southwest Texas State College
- Stephen F. Austin State University
- Texas A & I University
- *Texas A & M University System*
- *Texas Southern University*
- *Texas Tech University*
- Texas Woman's University
- *University of Houston*
- *University of Texas System*
- *University of Texas at Austin*
- West Texas State University

UTAH
- Southern Utah State College
- *Utah State University*
- *University of Utah*

VERMONT
- Castleton State College
- Johnson State College
- Lyndon State College
- *University of Vermont*

VIRGINIA
- Clinch Valley College
- George Mason College University of Virginia
- Longwood College
- Madison College
- Mary Washington College
- Norfolk State College
- Radford College
- *University of Virginia*
- Virginia Commonwealth University
- *Virginia Polytechnic Institute*
- *Virginia State College*

VIRGIN ISLANDS
- College of the Virgin Islands

WASHINGTON
- Central Washington State College
- Eastern Washington State College
- The Evergreen State College
- *University of Washington*
- *Washington State University*
- Western Washington State College

WEST VIRGINIA
- Bluefield State College
- Concord College
- Fairmont State College
- Marshall University
- Shepherd College
- West Liberty Institute of Technology
- *West Virginia University*

WISCONSIN
- Stout State University
- *University of Wisconsin*
- *University of Wisconsin at Madison*
- Wisconsin State University at Eau Claire
- Wisconsin State University at La Crosse
- Wisconsin State University at Oshkosh
- Wisconsin State University at Platteville
- Wisconsin State University at River Falls
- Wisconsin State University at Stevens Point
- Wisconsin State University at Superior
- Wisconsin State University at Whitewater

WYOMING
- *University of Wyoming*

Italics are members of NASULGC

* Members of both Associations